

| | | | | |
|---|------------------------|--|---------------------|--|
| Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary | Application No. | | Applicant(s) | |
| | 10/648,361 | | SAARMA ET AL. | |
| | Examiner | | Art Unit | |
| | Maria B. Marvich, PhD | | 1633 | |

All Participants:

(1) Maria B. Marvich, PhD.

(2) Gerald Murphy.

Date of Interview: 14 September 2006

Type of Interview:

☒ Telephonic

☐ Video Conference

☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Status of Application: final rejection

(3) _____

(4) _____

Time: 11:00 am

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

Prior art documents discussed:

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

Attempted to contact applicant to amend claim 8 to put it in condition for allowance. However, contact not possible in timely fashion.

Part III.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

DAVE TRONG NGUYEN

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)